

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/065,723	11/13/2002	Kevin A. Batson	FIS920010179 6157		
30449	7590 03/20/2006		EXAMINER		
SCHMEISER, OLSEN + WATTS			BAKER, STEPHEN M		
3 LEAR JET SUITE 201	LANE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LATHAM,	NY 12110		2133		
			DATE MAILED: 03/20/200	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	e Action Summary	P	art of Paper No./Mail Date 031506	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB, Paper No(s)/Mail Date		_		
		•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	iist of the certified	copies not received	1.	
application from the International Bu	•	` ''		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum			n No	
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have heen re	ceived		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	(d) or (f).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note t	he attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the col			• •	
Applicant may not request that any objection to		-		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		bjected to by the E	xaminer.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	ninor			
Application Papers				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar		rement.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-12,14-16,21,22,24 and 25</u> is 7)□ Claim(s) <u>5,13,23 and 26</u> is/are objected to.	•			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>17-20</u> is/are allowed.	clara rainated			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consid	leration.		
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the applica	tion.			
Disposition of Claims				
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayl	e, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	owance except for	formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>6</u>	<u> 9 Decembe</u> r 2005			
Status				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the n earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS R 1.136(a). In no event, h n. eriod will apply and will explication tatute, cause the application	COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be timulated the community of the commun	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Period for Reply		VDIDE AMONTHI	C) OD THIDTY (20) DAVC	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	•			
	Examiner Stephen M. B	aker	Art Unit	
Office Action Summary	10/065,723		BATSON ET AL.	
	Application	NO.	Applicant(s)	

Application/Control Number: 10/065,723

Art Unit: 2133

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-16, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,662 to Kalter *et al* (hereafter "Kalter") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,639,898 to Sauer (hereafter "Sauer").

Kalter discloses a wide-I/O DRAM chip with spare bitlines and a "coupling circuit" that "directly connects" adjacent first or second bitlines to a "data line" based on a "steering signal." In one embodiment (not shown) the first and second bitlines are adjacent bitlines (col. 9, lines 19-24), although Kalter indicates that such an embodiment is not the most efficient. The first bitline may still be used as a replacement for the adjacent bitline on the side opposite the second bitline. The potential of the first bitline is presumably maintained at a desired potential, although a means for maintaining bitline potential is apparently outside the scope of Kalter's description of bitline sparing logic.

Sauer discloses maintaining bitlines at a desired potential to improve the operation of a memory array. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Sauer's bitline potential

Application/Control Number: 10/065,723

Art Unit: 2133

maintaining means into Kalter's DRAM. Such incorporation would have been obvious because Sauer teaches that maintaining bitlines at a desired potential improves the operation of a memory array.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Kalter shows more bitlines per column than the number of data lines, in the conventional manner.

Regarding claims 3 and 11, Kalter shows coupling one data line to one bitline, with a different bitline being coupled to each data line, in the conventional manner.

Regarding claims 4 and 12, Sauer's bitline potential maintaining is performed on failed bitlines.

Regarding claims 6 and 14, Kalter shows data lines to transfer data in parallel to the bitlines and bitlines coupled in parallel to plural memory cells, in the conventional manner.

Regarding claims 7 and 15, Kalter's data lines are "arranged in serial order" and each data line has a corresponding "means for coupling ... to corresponding respective second bitlines," in the conventional manner.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, Kalter's steering signals of course correspond to positions of failed bitlines.

Regarding claims 21 and 24, Kalter's sense amps serve as a "latch stage connected to a switch stage," in the conventional manner.

Regarding claims 22 and 25, Kalter teaches an "additional coupling circuit" as recited, to accommodate more than one spare.

Art Unit: 2133

3. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-16, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,662 to Kalter *et al* (hereafter "Kalter") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,499,211 to Kirihata *et al* (hereafter "Kirihata").

Kalter discloses a wide-I/O DRAM chip with spare bitlines and a "coupling circuit" that "directly connects" adjacent first or second bitlines to a "data line" based on a "steering signal." In one embodiment (not shown) the first and second bitlines are adjacent bitlines (col. 9, lines 19-24), although Kalter indicates that such an embodiment is not the most efficient. The first bitline may still be used as a replacement for the adjacent bitline on the side opposite the second bitline. The potential of the first bitline is presumably maintained at a desired potential, although a means for maintaining bitline potential is apparently outside the scope of Kalter's description of bitline sparing logic.

Kirihata discloses maintaining bitlines at a desired potential to improve the operation of a memory array. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Kirihata's bitline potential maintaining means into Kalter's DRAM. Such incorporation would have been obvious because Kirihata teaches that maintaining bitlines at a desired potential improves the operation of a memory array.

Regarding claim 4, Kirihata's bitline potential maintaining is performed on failed bitlines.

Application/Control Number: 10/065,723 Page 5

Art Unit: 2133

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 17-20 are allowed.

5. Claims 5, 13, 23 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-16, 21, 22, 24 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Baker whose telephone number is (571) 272-3814. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (11:00 AM 7:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/065,723

Art Unit: 2133

723 Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen M. Baker Primary Examiner Art Unit 2133

smb